

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 29 are pending after entry of this amendment. Independent claims 1, 11, 14, 17, 22, 23, and 24 have been amended to recite “a design representing electrical or mechanical assemblies.” Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed application at, for example, paragraphs [0018] and [0025].

Claims 26 – 29 have been added. Support for added claims 26 – 29 can be found throughout the originally-filed application at, for example, paragraphs [0018] and [0019].

I. FORMAL MATTERS

A. Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner’s inclusion in the Action a copy of the PTO forms submitted in the IDS filed on August 3, 2007 and September 5, 2007. The references listed therein are initialed by the Examiner, thereby indicating that they have been considered and will be listed on the face of any patent that issues from the present application.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102(a)

Claims 1 – 25 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,567,783 to Notani et al. (“Notani”). With regard to the amended claims, this rejection is traversed at least because Notani does not teach or suggest the manipulation of “a design representing electrical or mechanical assemblies” (see claim 1; also see claims 11, 14, 17, 22, 23, and 24). Furthermore, Notani does not teach or suggest creating, communicating, or loading of “at least one application state file representing . . . at least one manipulation of said design” (see claim 1; see also claims 11, 14, 17, 22, 23, and 24).

The subject technology is directed to the synchronous and asynchronous manipulation of “design data representing electrical or mechanical assemblies” between

session client processes by communicating application state information over a network without having to exchange the underlying design data or graphical images thereof. See originally-filed application at [0018]. One advantage of the subject technology is that it reduces network load and increases response times because relatively small amounts of state information are communicated, instead of the underlying data or images. Furthermore, the subject technology reduces processing load on the client platforms by eliminating the need to prepare, send, receive and process large data sets or graphical images. Furthermore, users in different design domains (for example, users who work with mechanical representations of the design vs. users who work with logic schematics of the design) can seamlessly collaborate with each other because the subject technology normalizes domain specific manipulations which can be read and interpreted by each of the session client applications. See originally-filed application at [0019]. Furthermore, the subject technology enhances security because the underlying design data or images thereof are not exposed to the network. See originally-filed application at [0022] Applicant would like to point out that the subject technology does not necessarily preclude the transmission of the underlying data or images along with application state information. See originally-filed application at [0019]

In contrast to the present invention, Notani describes a publish/subscribe communication model. See Notani, col. 15, lines 17 – 32 and FIG. 14. The communication model includes an event manager which communicates with a workflow module for running a workflow. Notani appears to define a workflow as “a set of activities joined by dataflows that together accomplish some tasks.” See Notani, column 2, lines 21 - 22.

Notani does not teach or suggest the manipulation of “design data representing electrical or mechanical assemblies,” as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully asserts that the workflows described in Notani are not the same as the “design data representing electrical or mechanical assemblies.” For example, as described above, the workflows in Notani are “a set of activities joined by dataflows that together accomplish some tasks.” Sets of activities for accomplishing some tasks are

clearly not the same as “design data representing electrical or mechanical assemblies,” recited in claim 1.

Furthermore , because Notani does not teach or suggest the recited “design data representing electrical or mechanical assemblies,” it could not teach or suggest creating, communicating, or loading of “at least one application state file representing . . . at least one manipulation of said design,” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, for at least the reasons described above, Notani neither anticipates nor renders obvious the claimed subject matter and Applicant asserts that each of claims 1, 11, 14, 17, 22, 23, and 24, and each of the dependent claims therefrom, is patentable over Notani. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejections.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: December 17, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Steven Cohen

Registration No.: 59,503

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Massachusetts 02205

(617) 239-0840

Attorneys For Applicant